

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/723,810 | 11/26/2003 | Thomas Evans | 138963-1 | 6534 |
| 43248 7590 06/20/2007 CANTOR COLBURN LLP - GE PLASTICS - SMITH 55 GRIFFIN RD SOUTH | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | GAKH, YELENA G | |
| BLOOMFIELI | 5, C1 06002 | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1743 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/20/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/723,810 | EVANS ET AL. | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | | Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D. | 1743 | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply | | orrespondence address | | |
| A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in a sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Ap</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E | action is non-final. see except for formal matters, pro | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 10) | The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example. | epted or b) objected to by the E Irawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obje | 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | |
| Priority u | nder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment | c(s) | | | | |
| 2) Notice 3) Inform | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dal 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other: | e | | |

Art Unit: 1743

1

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: forensic analytical technique selected from resonance spectroscopy methods, SEM-EDX, XPS-EPCA, with each of the method also a different specie (claim 7); luminescence spectroscopy, fluorescence spectroscopy, etc. (claim 8) with fluorescence and luminescence spectroscopy being one species, color spectrophotometry and visual observation – another species, electronic spectroscopy (?) – third species, vibrational spectroscopy - forth species; NMR spectroscopy in combination with luminescence (claim 9); and NMR spectroscopy in combination with visual (claim 10). The species are independent or distinct, because they are different analytical spectroscopic methods, each of which has different nature and requires a separate search.

Examiner's note: the examiner believes that the dependency of the claims is in error, since most of the spectroscopic methods listed in claim 8 dependent on claim 7 are not resonance spectroscopy techniques; at the same time NMR spectroscopy recited in claims 9 and 10 dependent on claim 8 (which does not recite resonance methods) is a resonance spectroscopy.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

2. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: authentication marker selected from group listed in claims 16 and 37. The species are independent or distinct, because they are different substituents with different properties and requiring different search.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 and 36 are generic.

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: miscible polymer selected from the group listed in claims 20-24. The species are independent or distinct, because they are different polymers requiring different search.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,810

Art Unit: 1743

Y

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 20 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

4. A telephone call was made to Pamela J. Curbelo on 06/15/07 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1743

1

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6/15/07

YELENA GAKH PRIMARY EXAMINER